

REMARKS

Applicant has amended claims 1-4, 6, 18 and 20 and canceled claims 7-12, 17 and 19 as being drawn to the non-elected invention. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments to the claims are supported by the application as originally filed and do not contain any new matter. Accordingly, the Office Action will be discussed in terms of the claims as amended.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 20 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Applicant has amended the claims and respectfully submits that these claims now comply with 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 15 under 35 USC 102 as being anticipated by Davies, stating that Davies discloses a verb and object database constructed by associated verbs and objects related to each other and by associated retrieval keywords related to the combination of them.

In reply thereto, Applicant has carefully reviewed Davies and respectfully submits that Davies refers to methods and systems for selecting data sets and the method thereof based upon a noun, verb, adjective or predetermined set of indicia followed by a noun, verb, adjective or predetermined set of indicia and particularly is based upon the location of the noun, verb, adjective or indicia (see col. 2, lines 17-29). Still further, Applicant respectfully submits that Davies does not suggest such a system could be utilized as a law retrieval apparatus and particularly a law retrieval apparatus comprising a verb and object database constructed by associating verbs and objects related to each other and by associating keywords with these related or associated combinations of verbs and objects. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that with the law retrieval apparatus of Applicant's invention presents a significant advantage over the prior art. In particular, utilizing the verb and object retrieval processing means of Applicant's invention, a highly efficient search can be easily made even by a person with no legal training. Also, using the meta-keyword retrieval processing means of Applicant's invention, a search can be easily done by a person unfamiliar with difficult legal terms since there is no need to consider if the term to be searched can be used as a keyword or not.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every element of Applicant's invention as claimed by claims 5 and 15 are not contained in Davies and claims 5 and 15 are not anticipated thereby.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 13-14 and 18 under 35 USC 103 as being obvious over Walfish in view of Balogh, stating that Walfish discloses associating non-retrieval keywords with retrieval keywords adequate for replacing the non-retrieval keywords, information analysis portion for determining whether or not a received keyword is a non retrieval keyword, a retrieval processing portion when the determination for the keyword is a non-retrieval keyword, but does not explicitly indicate the meta-keyword database; Balogh teaches a meta-keyword database; and it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Walfish in view of Balogh.

Applicant has carefully reviewed Walfish and respectfully submits that Walfish discloses a system and method for automatically correcting a misspelled word in a word process document. In other words, Applicant respectfully submits that Walfish is essentially a spell checker to be used with a word processing program and is not a law retrieval apparatus.

Still further, Applicant has carefully reviewed Balogh and respectfully submits that Balogh is a system for image storage and also has nothing to do with law retrieval. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to either the teachings of Walfish or Balogh in developing a law retrieval system such as Applicant's invention and would only do so utilizing hindsight supplied by Applicant's invention. In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that with the law retrieval apparatus of Applicant's invention presents a significant advantage over the prior art. In particular, utilizing the verb and object retrieval processing means of Applicant's invention, a highly efficient search can be easily made even by a person with no legal training. Also, using the meta-keyword retrieval processing means of Applicant's invention, a search can be easily done by a person unfamiliar with difficult legal terms since there is no need to consider if the term to be searched can be used as a keyword or not.

In view of the above, therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 13-14 and 18 are not obvious over Walfish in view of Balogh.

In view of the above, therefore, it is respectfully requested that this Amendment be entered, favorably considered and the case passed to issue.

Please charge any additional costs incurred by or in order to implement this Amendment
or required by any requests for extensions of time to KODA & ANDROLIA DEPOSIT
ACCOUNT NO. 11-1445.

Respectfully submitted,

KODA & ANDROLIA

By:

William L. Androlia
Reg. No. 27,177

2029 Century Park East
Suite 1430
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Tel: (310) 277-1391
Fax: (310) 277-4118

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile
transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office Fax No. (703) 872-
9306 on June 9, 2004.

William L. Androlia
Name

Signature

6/9/2004
Date